

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 9, 13-15, 17-18 and 20-22 are amended.

Claims 6-8 and 10-12 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-5, 9, and 13-24 are pending and under consideration.

ITEM 10: ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner objects to claims 13 and 14 as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicates claims 13 and 14 are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. (Action at page 8).

Applicants thank the Examiner for such indication of allowability. Claims 13 and 14 are rewritten herein in independent form and withdrawal of the objections are requested.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Independent claims 1, 9, 15, 17-18 and 20-22 are amended herein to include features that the Examiner has determined are allowable. (Action at page 8).

Claim 1 is amended to include features of dependent claims 6-8 that are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 9 is amended to include features of dependent claims 10-12 that are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 13 and 14 are amended herein so as to be rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 15, 17-18, and 20-22 are amended to recite that "structure information of electronic documents of a linked document group having a link source that is a starting point document and having corresponding display priority values that are smaller than a predetermined first set value are not analyzed." (See, for example, claims 13, 14).

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended independent claims (and claims dependent thereon) are respectfully requested.

ITEMS 4-5: REJECTION OF CLAIM 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph contending that the language is indefinite and "fails to disclose which of the operations . . . are repeated." Claim 9 is amended herein to recite that "analyzing the structure information, the specifying a display document, the specifying a document group, and the searching for the electronic document are repeated recursively." Applicants submit that claim 9, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. §112 and request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 9.

- ITEM 7: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 6, AND 18-24 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER MACKINLAY (U.S.P. 6,088,032)**
- ITEM 8: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, and 12 UNDER 35 U.S.C §103(a) OVER MACKINLAY IN VIEW OF WHITE (U.S.P. 6,034,689)**
- ITEM 9: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, and 12 UNDER 35 U.S.C §103(a) OVER STOUB (U.S.P. 6,389,437)**

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 6, and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mackinlay, claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mackinlay in view of White, and claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stoub (Action at pages 2-6, 6-7, and 7-8, respectively).

***Prima Facie* Obviousness Not Established**

Independent Claims Recite Features Not Taught By Cited Art Alone Or In Combination

As provided in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974).

The Examiner indicated that claims 13 and 14 recite features of the present invention that are allowable. That is, claim 13 recites allowable features for a document display method "specifying of the document group constituent documents, the structure information of the electronic documents of the linked document group having the link source that is the starting point document and having the corresponding display priority values that are smaller than a predetermined first set value are not analyzed." Claim 14 recites allowable features that "in said specifying of the document group constituent documents, computer resources needed to manage said electronic documents of the linked document group having the link source that is the starting point document and having the corresponding display priority values that are smaller than a predetermined second set value are released." (Action at page 8).

Applicants submit that each of the independent claims are amended herein to recite features such as the Examiner has indicated are allowable.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites an apparatus wherein "structure analysis means scans each linked document based on the structure information held by an origin electronic document, analyzes a document group structure and stores information corresponding to the document group structure in said structure storage means, wherein said structure analysis means does not scan linked documents of electronic documents having a display priority having a value that is smaller than a predetermined first set value, and wherein said structure analysis means excludes electronic documents having a display priority that has a value smaller than a predetermined second set value from a management target of the

document group structure stored in said structure storage means, and releases computer resources needed for a management of said excluded electronic documents." (Emphasis added).

Independent claim 9, as amended, includes features of both claims 13 and 14, which the examiner found separately allowable.

Independent claims 15, 17-18, and 20-22 are amended to recite that "structure information of electronic documents of a linked document group having a link source that is a starting point document and having corresponding display priority values that are smaller than a predetermined first set value are not analyzed." (Emphasis added).

Applicants submit that each of the independent claims, as amended, recite features that the Examiner has indicated as allowable, that is features that are not taught by the cited art alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants submit that *prima facie* obviousness is not established.

Conclusion

Claims 6-8 and 10-12 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Since *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection of claims 1-5, 9, and 16-24 should be withdrawn, and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 23, 2004

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501